UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

Leadership—New Series

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

The Fighting Farmers of Russia

By ANNA LOUISE STRONG

Gandhi and the Lahore Conference

By KIRBY PAGE

Mars Triumphant

By DAVID JOBMAN

VOLUME CIV NUMBER 23

Chicago, February 24, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

GORDON COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, · Business Agents.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., · } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 12, 1929, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

SPECIAL!

Five Articles on Russia

by

Anna Louise Strong

Miss Strong has lived in Russia for a large part of every year since the Revolution in 1917. She has traveled in every part of the country, and has crossed Siberia and China. She knows all the leaders of the Soviet Republic and is in intimate touch with all political and social movements. These articles are written from Russia where she is now residing.

The subjects of this special series of articles are as follows:

The Fighting Farmers of Russia.
The Year of the Great "Breakover" in Russia.
Soviet Rulers on Vacation.
Russia to Cut Down on Alcohol and Babies.
Moving Out from the Ranks in Russia, or Raising Up Managers.

These five articles will be published in successive numbers of Unity beginning with the issue for February 24.

Subscribe Now $3.00 Per Year

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 355
Leadership—New Series—ALSON H. ROBINSON. 357
Jottings—J. H. H. 359

ARTICLES—

Education—*Thomas H. Huxley* 355
The Fighting Farmers of Russia—ANNA LOUISE STRONG 359
Gandhi and the Lahore Conference—KIRBY PAGE 361
Mars Triumphant—DAVID JOBMAN 364

POETRY—

The Amazons, or the Petticoat Brigade 363

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Practitioner of the Humanities—ALFRED ARTYN GROSS 365

CORRESPONDENCE—

India's Wrongs—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 366

THE FIELD—

An Appeal to Our Fellow Citizens—*The India Independence League* 367
A Jew's Creed—*Myron W. Jacobs* 368

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CIV | MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1930 | NUMBER 23

EDUCATION

"Education is the instruction of the intellect in the laws of nature, under which name I include not merely things and their forces, but men and their ways; and the fashioning of their affections and of the will into an earnest and loving desire to move in harmony with those laws. . . .

"That man, I think, has had a liberal education who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, and does with ease and pleasure all the work that, as a mechanism, it is capable of; whose intellect is a clear, cold, logic engine, with all its parts of equal strength, and in smooth working order, ready, like a steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, and spin the gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind; whose mind is stored with a knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of nature and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire, but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art, to hate all vileness, and to respect others as himself."

—*Thomas H. Huxley.*

In the January 6th issue of UNITY, we announced our hope, or rather expectation, that we should be able to publish during this coming year a series of weekly articles containing valuable material in literary, ethical and religious subjects from the unpublished manuscripts of Leo Tolstoy. We stated that these manuscripts are now being edited and published in Russia by the Soviet government, and that among them has been found a kind of diary, or commonplace book, in which Tolstoy had set down each day his passing thoughts on questions of the hour and on basic problems of human living. At the time of writing this announcement we were in correspondence with Vladimir Tchertkoff, the editor of the new edition of Tolstoy's writings, to the end of securing permission to print this diary, or parts thereof, in these columns. We have now received word from Tchertkoff which gives us full control of the material in question, and we shall proceed at once to prepare it for serial publication. Three chapters of the original twelve (one for each month of the year) are already in our hands, and the others will come along quickly. It is not probable, however, that we shall be ready to begin publication until the late spring or early summer, as the work requires considerable editorial revision for our purposes. The series will probably run for a period of months, and thus carry over into the new year. Due announcement will be made in this place of the beginning of this important feature. Meanwhile, we would congratulate our readers on the great privilege of having in their hands this new, first-hand Tolstoy material. These diary reflections, frequently interspersed with striking quotations, ancient and modern, which chanced to appeal to Tolstoy's mind, constitute an amazing disclosure of the soul of this Russian whom so many of us reverence as the outstanding spiritual genius of modern times. The great precedent established by UNITY in its publication of Gandhi's autobiography, is here gloriously sustained.

It is much too early to prophesy anything about the London Naval Conference. To attempt to do so while the Conference is actively going on, especially in these columns where a word is printed a full two weeks, at least, after it is written, would be absurd. Yet we may be pardoned for saying that it seems to us as though the Conference were making progress, and that there is good reason, therefore, for optimism. The great and central fact, of course, is the accord between Britain and America, so nobly manifested in the statesmanlike program for parity between the two nations. What has been a stumbling block now seems to be in a fair way to be lifted out of the road of progress and made a cornerstone of the world's edifice of peace. For if these two great naval powers can agree, and by so doing dismiss the contingency of war between them, why cannot other powers do the same? Of course, difficulties of enormous magnitude still exist. France's stubborn reliance for security upon force, is one of them. Italy's foolish insistence upon parity with France is another. Not the least of all is the big-navy group here at home, headed in the Senate by that feeble and peculiarly dense politician, Hale, of Maine. But these and other difficulties lie between the slowly grinding millstones of MacDonald on the one hand and Hoover on the other. These two men mean business. They have to now, as failure in any degree at London means a blow at their prestige which would overthrow MacDonald and bring into serious

hazard the prospects of Hoover's second administration. So we expect these millstones to grind relentlessly until difficulties have been reduced to powder. We await developments from day to day with almost breathless eagerness. There will be disappointments and aggravations a-plenty these next few weeks, but we shall not permit them to dampen our ardor nor diminish our hope.

We are reminded by newspaper items here and there that this month marks the one-hundredth anniversary of the independence of modern Greece. This independence was conceded by Turkey in 1829, after a war of five years' duration, but the protocol creating the separate state was not signed until February 3rd, 1830. This is an event, it seems to us, which calls for wider notice and observance than it has received. Next only to Zionism, the revival of ancient Greece is the most romantic nationalist movement of modern times. For centuries this greatest of ancient nations was sunk in ruin and decay. Its cities were memories, its monuments stone-quarries, its people filthy swine-herds or wandering brigands. Then came the magic of the popular awakening, the war for freedom that stirred the world, and the modern kingdom (now republic) of Greece. But this story is made further memorable by the great names attached thereto. Foremost of them all is Lord Byron, whose stormy life came to a glorious close at Missolonghi in 1824. Next, in the thought of all Americans, stands the name of Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, husband of Julia Ward Howe, benefactor of the blind, and in his youth "the Lafayette of the Greek Revolution." Profoundly moved by the uprising of the Greeks, this young physician went to their assistance, and serving as surgeon-in-chief of the Greek fleet, had many romantic adventures. On his return to Boston he raised large relief funds for the exhausted people. Recent history of Greece has not been creditable. One of the grasping and greedy Balkan states, Greece was deeply involved in those unhappy wars in southeast Europe which did so much to bring on the Great War. In this vast conflict itself, the nation was led by internal political squabbles to become involved in a struggle which could only ruin her, and thus fell easy prey to the marauding expeditions of the Allies. Then came the revolutions precipitated by the adventurer, Venizelos, and at last the present pitiful republic. But the romance of modern Greece still remains what it was a hundred years ago. Disasters in the Great War, of which she was not the agent but the victim, will be forgotten. A great future, suffused with the glow of an immortal past, lies on before.

It is interesting to note that there is a serious prohibition issue to the fore in England, which involves the same questions of obedience to, or defiance of, law which are being so furiously discussed in this country in connection with the Eighteenth Amendment. The issue in England concerns not alcoholic beverages but the new Church of England prayer book, use of which has been *prohibited* by Parliament. If Englishmen were like most Americans, who scornfully defy any law they do not like, the clergy and laity of the Establishment would now be going right ahead and asking Parliament and the King what they were going to do about it. And it is only fair to say that there are certain recalcitrant priests who are advising, and even following, this policy. But the Church as a whole refuses to heed any such leadership as this, and is now busily at work trying to find how the question can be solved with full justice to both church and state. Central to the contention of the Established Church is the idea, enunciated by Archbishop Davidson before his retirement, that the Church must formulate its own faith and arrange its own form of worship. That is to say, it must have the right to use a prayer book of its own selection! On the other hand is the fundamental fact that the Church, duly established under the law, must obey the law. And the law declares that the 1928 prayer book is illegal! There would seem to be no escape from this dilemma except in the drastic action of disestablishing the Church. Everybody apparently shrinks from this, yet everybody will accede to it as an alternative to defying government. Lawlessness such as we know in this country, in the case not only of Prohibition but of all other laws, is impossible in England. Says Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of York, referring to the English clergy in the present crisis, *"We have either to obey the law in the fullest sense, or else to refrain from exercising our ministry."* Translated into the vernacular of the Prohibition situation in America, this statement would read: "We have either to obey the law in the fullest sense, or else refrain from exercising our citizenship."

Two months ago—or was it three months ago?—Governor Young, of California, referred the case of "Tom" Mooney to his Advisory Pardon Board. We thought, and said at the time in these columns, that this was a shrewd way of "passing the buck." No sane or sincere man needed any advice as to whether Mooney were innocent of the charge which placed him behind the bars thirteen years ago. Had Governor Young had the courage to face the issue, he would have freed Mooney, and also Billings, upon the instant. But political conditions are queer in California, public opinion is intolerant, powerful influences are eager to keep Mooney and Billings out of the way—and Young was glad to be able to shove the responsibility onto somebody else, and incidentally also to divide it among several persons. All this was patent enough last No-

vember when the Governor, after months of indecision, asked his Pardon Board to help him out. But we were cheerful about the matter, for we knew that these two prisoners had at last been proved innocent, and we felt sure that this act of the Governor was only the settlement of the exact way in which the belated act of justice should be consummated. But now we are getting discouraged again, and also indignant. Week after week, month after month, are passing by, and nothing is happening. The Pardon Board is stalling through the winter precisely as the Governor stalled through all last summer. What excuse for such delay has the Board got to offer? It cannot be lack of opinion—"a few hours' time," says the *New Republic,* with accuracy, "is all that any one should need to convince himself that Mooney and Billings were railroaded to prison on perjured evidence." Can it be that the Board is seeking to "pass the buck" on to some one else? Whatever the excuse, or lack of excuse, the situation is a black disgrace, and becomes blacker still with every passing hour. Nitti's new book, "Escape," tells the horrors of false arrest and imprisonment in Mussolini's Italy. Where in that record of untempered despotism can be found anything worse than this story of Mooney and Billings in this so-called American democracy?

New York City is showing us the kind of world we live in. For weeks past, for example, a noise-registering machine has been driven about the streets of the metropolis, to catch and measure the noises which beat every minute upon the sensitive nerves of the citizens. The result is an appalling exhibition of shocks and jars. Waves of sound in a great city are whipped into a constant storm of fury, and beat upon the ear-drums like huge breakers of the sea upon granite cliffs. These cliffs are slowly worn away—how about our ears? A somewhat similar apparatus is now being used in New York to register the dust and smoke contained in the air breathed by its inhabitants. This apparatus has detected the interesting fact that every million cubic yards of city atmosphere contained during January last an average of 1.35 pounds of impurities. The instrument showed that the air was purest at 4 A. M., and most polluted at 9 A. M. With noise and dirt thus under observation, what about light? This is perhaps less important, since, by the curious provision of nature, the eye can be covered and thus closed, whereas the ear and the nose must always remain open. None the less, to those who live in cities, the light problem is important. More and more is night being turned into day. Every store, theatre, restaurant, must now have its flashing electric sign. Billboards are no longer adequate for outdoor advertising, but must be displaced by huge blazes of electric letters against the sky. The latest innovations are searchlights which, placed a-top our skyscrapers, sweep with their penetrating shafts of illumination the homes and haunts of men. This is the world we live in—those of us, at least, who dwell in cities! If Cowper prayed in his time,

> "O, for a lodge in some vast wilderness,"

what would he say today?

Leadership—New Series

Is it too much to affirm that the future of Western civilization depends upon five men? Literally, that probably is too strong a statement, but it will scarcely over-emphasize the responsibility of the leaders at the London Conference. There is something little short of pathetic in the attitude with which the great inarticulate masses whom they represent regard them. They have been sent there, these leaders of the new *style,* for a very definite purpose. They stand as the perfect incarnation of a consuming passion on the part of their followers to say "goodby to all that," and to declare in no uncertain terms that they have reached the journey's end so far as war is concerned. No group of leaders has ever been chosen before with quite the singleness of purpose of these five delegates.

One factor which lends uniqueness to this variety of leadership is its civil as contrasted with its military character. A certain modicum of Admirals and such like supernumeraries, seems to have been desirable for appearance sake. Rumor has it, however, that numerous conferences of importance have been arranged without them. From their point of view, they ought to be grateful for an opportunity to visit the Tower of London and numerous other museums which serve as repositories of those symbols which afford them childish delight.

This new style of leadership, however unique the task upon which it may be engaged or clear the commission which it holds is yet related to that stream of leadership which has marked every step in the painful progress of the race. Among these elements of relationship is the fact that first and foremost a leader is dependent upon his followers. That sounds axiomatic enough, but sometimes both leaders and followers forget how vital the relationship is. Apart from some Don Quixote, marshalling his flock of sheep, or valiantly attacking the astonished windmills, a leader without followers is unthinkable. Such dependence grows

out of the fact that most of the effective leaders of whom history gives us a record have appeared upon the common level of their followers.

To be sure, this common origin has often been supplemented by Divinity. Their followers have required supernaturalism as a sort of compensatory reaction, whatever that may mean. Such was the case of Jesus and Buddha; while many a national hero has been idealized to a point which would make him feel very strange were he to return to the scenes of his earthly struggle. Political leaders particularly recognize the necessity of emphasizing this point of common origin. Governor Smith was able to make the sidewalks of New York his slogan, while Mr. Hoover's advisers, struggling with the impediment of wealth, made great capital out of the modest pretension of the house in which he was born.

During periods of emotional stress when the mind of the group is strongly focused upon the success of some common enterprise, he is a hardy spirit who fails to follow the leader. But when depression arises and business falls off, conditions over which, after all, in our complex society, he has very little control, we want a new leader. Now all leaders know this. They know that they are dependent upon the good will of their constituents; which is one of the reasons why many of them are not to be regarded as leaders at all, but merely reflectors of the opinions of those who maintain them in positions of authority.

The responsibility of these five men in London raises also the question of the function of leadership. One of the by-products of our mechanical age has been to clarify the meaning of the word function. Every small boy knows, for example, what function the carburetor of a gasoline engine performs, and he knows that if you take that part away, the entire machine is rendered useless. Common sense teaches the same thing with reference to the functions of the various organs of the human body. Unhappily you cannot substitute one of these instruments of our anatomy such as the heart or lungs and expect matters to go on as though nothing had happened.

From the point of view of function in leadership, however, there is a fairly common denominator which may be expressed in terms of relationship; and when one applies this common denominator to the task of leadership, its function becomes not a matter of setting oneself apart from the group as Lord of all Creation, but it rather means the cultivation of those invisible and intangible relations which bind people together. It requires a very keen sensibility to recognize what these intangibles are. Sometimes leaders fall into the blunder of thinking that you can bind individuals or groups together through the medium of such factors as blood relationship or the acquisition of territory; but even members of the same family have a perverse habit of falling apart unless there is something more binding than the mere accident of birth to hold them together, while nations which once were comrades in arms fly at one another's throats in a futile effort to divide the spoils of victory.

Standing over against this function of the new leadership one sees the dark and sinister shadow of Dictatorship. But something tells us that all is not well with the dictators. What happened in Spain recently may or may not be symptomatic, but the New York *World* in commenting on the political change which has taken place there made the following statement:

> The notion that a personal dictator can reconstruct an ancient civilization is a fantastic illusion. A dictator can fight wars and suppress a class struggle; he can build roads and monuments; he can cut red tape and clean out a certain amount of dry rot. He can carry a people past a dead center of its political history. But he cannot create a new nation and provide it with brand-new institutions. Nations are alive and in the end they must be governed by their own necessities and purposes, not by decree and fiat.

Professor Seligman has recently pointed out that the various professions, and even the field of natural science itself, are being starved in quality and amount of leadership. It is being drained off into business. Omniscience ought not to be necessary to recognize that even business cannot succeed in the long run if that is permitted to continue. One of the reasons why business has been able to command this efficient body of leadership lies in the fact that it has a very definite knowledge of what it wants to do. Herein may lie the secret of what various other interests must do to regain their influence. This is possibly where the church, for example, is primarily deficient. If the churches which regard themselves as liberal were willing to stand out against the tragic suppression of individuality as over against the standardizing forces of today, they might find far less difficulty in recruiting their leaders.

When one rides through the outskirts of Philadelphia on the Pennsylvania railroad, he passes by mile upon mile of identical little houses in which presumably people live. These people may be standardized with reference to the number of rooms they occupy, but they do not need to be cast into a single mould in the expression of their personalities, nor do they normally desire it. When some institution will come forward which will declare for emancipation from this sort of thing, confidence in human nature encourages us to believe that there will be no lack of adequate leadership.

Alson H. Robinson.

Jottings

What does a cancelled subscription mean? Lots of things! (3) *A desire for vengeance upon an innocent and helpless offender.*

Boston is to celebrate her 300th anniversary birthday (September 17th) by a great gathering of warships in her harbor and a great military procession in her streets. We wonder what cities and nations will do for celebrations when disarmament comes.

Nothing could suit us better than the proposed organization of a new political party on the "wet" issue. As an ardent "dry," we think this idea is perfectly grand. Let's have a party dedicated to this one idea of getting rid of the Eighteenth Amendment! This is emphatically the right way to proceed to fight this law. Incidentally, also, it is the sure way to get a "show-down" on the law. And we don't fear the "show-down!"

The *Atlantic Monthly* has at last learned to spell the word "Negro" with a capital N. The influence of this paper should do much to establish this proper usage as the standard.

We have discovered why the proposed new calendar is making such slow progress. This calendar calls for a year of 13 months, quarters of 13 weeks each, and a Friday the 13th in every month. No wonder the superstitious are up in arms!

Mr. Hughes is now Chief Justice in place of Mr. Taft. This changes the character of the Supreme Court not a whit. Its one claim to distinction still remains "Holmes and Brandeis dissenting."

J. H. H.

The Fighting Farmers of Russia

A constant running fight goes on in the Russian countryside today between the representatives of communism, expressed by the government, and the representatives of individualism, expressed by the wealthier peasant class. It continues all year but intensifies at this season after harvest, with the control of newly reaped crops as the prize to the victor.

The government taxes the better-to-do peasant out of all proportion, while it organizes the poor, the widows, the peasants without livestock into collective farms for which the government ploughs with tractors and takes payment in wheat. Even the use of tractors, most of which the government owns, is refused to the wealthier ones, who see themselves steadily sinking in importance in their community. They retort by organizing sentiment against the Kol-hozes (collective farms) and when the battle grows tense they resort to burning the crops of the collectives and assassinating the agents of the government.

The southern Ukraine and Northern Caucasus, through which I have just journeyed are known as the nation's bread-basket. I found that one important district official after another, to whom I had notes of introduction, was away in the country, "mobilized" for the "grain-gathering." At this season of the year the best strength in government offices is thrown into the field, as in war-time, in the fight for control of grain.

The struggle is intensified during the past year or two on account of the "Five-Year Plan" and the rapid industrialization going on in Russia. The number of city workers increases rapidly, and they must be fed. They are, moreover, getting far better food than Russian workers got before, more wheat bread, meat, sugar, butter. Even the Russian peasant, who before the war ate on an average only 396 pounds of bread per year, is now eating 756 pounds, or nearly twice as much. Hence, though crops are now ranging at or above pre-war there is a steady grain shortage, and the natural result of this would be higher prices than the cities can afford to pay. The state fixes a price on grain and the fight begins.

The government's first weapon is "contract system." Literally millions of peasants buy seed, implements and even food on credit, through the state credit agencies, and agree in advance to furnish their excess crop to the state at an agreed price. The price is fixed on a basis of cost of labor, and as such is not an unfair one, but it is definitely lower than the free market price for grain during seasons of scarcity like the present.

Theoretically, a free market is not forbidden to the peasant; it was, in fact, the chief characteristic of the "new economic policy" adopted in 1921. But actually many restrictions are placed on this freedom, and these increase in seasons when grain is tight and the government needs it. The private grain trader must be "licensed," and his taxes are so confiscatory that he usually evades the law and runs a boot-leg trade in wheat. This, of course, leaves him at the mercy of any court to which he comes as an "unlicensed trader;" his gains and goods are confiscated.

No pressure is brought on the small peasant who drives to a city market to sell his cart-load of grain. But the peasant who counts surplus not in cart-loads but in car-loads is closely watched. If he loyally sells two-thirds of his crop to the state at state prices, the local officials overlook his speculation with the rest. But if he tries to hold it all for higher prices or private dealing, then pressures begin by taxes and all other government means available, until he also hides his grain, perjures himself in tax-statements, and comes under the ban of the law.

At present some 40 per cent of the marketable grain in the country is in the hands of peasants able

to hold it for advances in price. In a capitalist land such farmers would be permitted to gain by their bargaining strength, as against the great milling interests who fix prices for the weaker farmers. But a government which has once fixed a price for the poor and loyal peasant cannot without loss of face increase that price to the higher and less loyal grain owners who are trying to "hold up" the cities. The state must use other weapons than a price increase.

For this reason, among others, the large-scale state farms are being organized. Farming on such a scale has never been attempted in the world before. The famous "Gigant," largest of the world's farms, reaped this fall, a crop from 150,000 acres and even at government prices claimed a net profit of three-quarters of a million dollars. (It must be remembered that no land values are figured, land counting as free in Russia). For the next year the network of giant farms is being greatly widened, and crops are expected from nearly five million acres on great state farms of the Grain Trust, which is being liberally financed and supplied with a greater assortment of modern farming machinery than exists on any one farm in the world today. Within five years this Grain Trust is expected to produce 40 per cent of Russia's marketable grain, thus reversing the balance of power.

I spent two days on the Gigant and an adjacent experimental farm of some hundred thousand acres. These are not farms; they are grain factories. It takes many days in a swift auto to see all of them. One unit after another is visited, each with its tents, tractors, farm machinery; each with its portable electric light for the camp and its headlights on the tractors for night work. I saw great tractors pulling five seeders behind them at once over the field, one such tractor seeding on a record day 225 acres. This is gigantic farming on a scale greater than has ever been tried. The supreme romance about it is that it is not being done by farmers, but by mechanics, professors, officials, people who until last year never tried anything like it. They are bringing over 50 American experts to act as leaders and instructors; they are making and expect to make gigantic mistakes. But they are putting it through.

All around these giant state farms are springing up the "Collective farms" of the peasants. The movement for "collectivization" which for ten years of the revolution went slowly, is now going far faster than the government can furnish it with tractors. In the region I have just visited, near the Gigant, some 9,000 peasants, or 26 per cent of the entire number of households, have been organized during the past year into collectives, while 14,000 more expressed a wish to be organized, but were told they could be given no help this season.

I visited one of these collectives and saw quickly why they are popular—more than popular, inevitable. If to the state the Kol-hoz is welcome as a source of loyal grain supply and an advance towards collectivism, to the peasant who joins it is a chance for survival. The Kol-hoz I visited had 195 households as members; and these had possessed altogether only 37 horses and 27 yoke of oxen. Only one-third of these households had therefore the means of ploughing their own land; this gives some picture of the desperately poor country-side. One-fourth of the members were widows, with no adult males in their families.

The process of organization was simple. The district was being surveyed and the land-holding redistricted; all persons wishing to join a Kol-hoz were told to register, that their lands might be distributed in a continuous piece. The lands of the members thus became a continuous large farm, capable of utilizing tractors and modern machinery. This machinery, together with mechanics and instructors, was furnished by the nearby State Farm, and the members of the Kol-hoz were taught to run it. Some day, as their joint wealth increased, they would be allowed to buy it on installments. Meantime, they paid for the ploughing and other mechanical services one-third of their crop. Since they worked with the aid of tractors five times as much as they had been able to work the previous year, they were quite willing and able to afford this.

Of the net crop received by the Kol-hoz, one-fifth went into a common fund for increasing their common property. Fifteen per cent was set aside as a fund for the "non-working members of families," i. e., the aged and children, whose support was thus partly carried by the group. The rest of the crop, which was still more than the entire crop of the previous year had been, went to the working members in proportion to their normal wages. Thus a tractorist got more than a girl who reaped sunflower seeds, and a man with a horse more than a man alone; all were credited with day's wages at the going rate in the district. If their harvest was good, their receipts might be more than day's wages; if poor, they would be less; but the proportion remained constant.

This is the simplest and most primitive form of Kol-hoz, doing least violence to the old peasant traditions of individualism. Each man remains owner of his own livestock; if he withdraws from the collective, he receives again his individual share of land. He is paid for the time and skill of work, in understandable wages, subject to the good and bad chances of harvest. He gets, meantime, government aid with tractors and modern machinery, which he could never himself afford. The advantages are obvious, as are the constraints. Of 195 families, 40 decided to withdraw after the first year, while 60 others applied to join. This shifting takes place in all collectives, chiefly of the peasants who are better off. The poorer ones have no choice; how else will they get land ploughed, having not even a horse or a yoke of oxen? It is upon the loyalty of these poorer ones that the government builds, giving tractors and getting grain.

In a year or two other economic factors affect the Kol-hoz. That 20 per cent of the crop that became common property is used for common barns, centrally placed, for common cows, giving milk to all; for a common day-nursery, looking after all babies while the mothers work in the fields. This is the new collectivization of the country-side which is proceeding faster than the state credit organizations can furnish funds. Only under some such form can tractor farming be applied to the ancient Russian village, with its split-up tiny holdings. Tractor farming fails in much of America because the farms are not large enough to keep the machinery busy. Russia answers by organizing larger units than the American ones.

Five years hence these collective farms are expected to furnish 30 per cent of the marketable grain of Russia. This is less than the 40 per cent expected of the State Farms, though the acreage will be vastly greater; for the members of the collective are more to feed. With the aid of these two grain sources, the government expects to control its wheat market completely. The individual producer, who just now is holding up the cities, will take what is given him, or quit; the prices will be set by the cost of large-scale mechanized farming.

The individual farmer of the richer sort fights bitterly. He feels that he has nothing to gain personally by joining a Kol-hoz; on the other hand, their growth means his ruin. Daily at this season the papers report murders and crop-burnings in connection with the class war in the villages. At Bobrova, the straw of a Kol-hoz is burned, "already the third fire in five months. First was burnt the hay of the organizer, then the hay of another prominent member, now the straw of the collective group new harvest." Down in the Caucasus other fires are mentioned. Over on the Volga night attacks with stones and sticks, beating up the families of the collective. No spot in the quiet Russian country-side is exempt from the struggle.

It is impossible for any one person to know what the chances of battle are over so wide an area. But eight years ago the peasant individualist compelled the state to beat a retreat in a new economic policy. Two years ago they compelled grain import by withholding supplies actually available. Today the odds seem in favor of the government. The tractor has turned the tide, and the peasants flooding into Kol-hozes get its benefits. ANNA LOUISE STRONG.

Gandhi and the Lahore Conference

(A Report by a Personal Observer)

The past week has been one of the most interesting of my life. It has been our privilege to watch the proceedings at the Indian National Congress from the inside. We have seen in action most of the outstanding nationalists of India.

The prediction that if the British Government failed to give additional assurances, Mahatma Gandhi would lead his people in a campaign of non-cooperation and civil disobedience with complete independence as the immediate objective, has been fulfilled. Whether he will succeed cannot now be foretold. The odds against him are titanic.

My chief impressions of the situation are that Mahatma Gandhi stands absolutely supreme among India's political leaders at the moment; that the nationalists who believe in the use of violence may gain the ascendance and sweep Gandhi aside if the struggle is prolonged; that the political rule of Great Britain in India is probably doomed; that India faces decades of strife and disorder before a stable and efficient Indian national government can be created; and that the nationalist leaders are motivated by the same love of liberty which drove George Washington and Thomas Jefferson to heroic action in 1776.

After the Lahore meeting there can be no doubt that Mahatmaji looms above his colleagues like a majestic peak above the plains. He had been elected President of the Congress for this year and had declined to accept. But in the Working Committee of fifteen members, in the Subjects Committee of two hundred, and in the main sessions of fifteen thousand, his influence was dominant. It is true that sections of his resolution relating to the reorganization of the Congress machinery were rejected, but no other leader wielded influence at all equal to his. The Presidential Address referred to him as "one who towers above all others in this present-day world of ours." The Moslem who gave the address of welcome said: "Mahatmaji is the one leader in whom the masses have faith. He is the one leader who commands nation-wide respect and affection." His name was mentioned literally hundreds of times in the public discussions.

India's saint has again assumed active political leadership. Indeed, Gandhi's political power is derived from his spiritual influence. Even his opponents pay reverent tribute to the godliness of his character, while the masses bow down in adoration before him. During one of the critical meetings of the Subjects Committee we saw striking evidence of the way he subordinates politics to religion. Even during the sessions of this supremely important assembly he has adhered to the practice of meeting with his friends for corporate worship each morning at 4:00 and each evening at 7:30. When the latter hour approached on Saturday, although one of his chief opponents had just risen to discuss an important point, the Mahatma slipped quietly out of a rear exit. Sherwood Eddy and I eagerly accepted an invitation from his private secretary to join them. As soon as he and those of us who followed were outside the tent, the Volunteers formed a human-chain about us and cleared a way through the crowd, which quickly recognized Gandhi and gave rousing cheers for him. After half an hour in corporate worship, he returned to his political responsibilities. Whether or not Gandhi will long retain this undisputed leadership can only be determined by the course of future events, but just now he exercises spiritual and political mastery over more millions of human beings than any other man of the age.

It appears to me that Britain's political rule in India is probably doomed. The consent of the governed is rapidly being withdrawn. A tiny community of one hundred and sixty-five thousand Britishers cannot continue much longer to rule three hundred and nineteen million Indians in the face of determined and sustained hostility and opposition. British sovereignty will doubtless be supplanted by full Dominion Status, in which case British rule will become a rapidly diminishing factor as in Canada, or by complete independence for the Indian people. That the temper of the nationalists is steadily becoming more embittered and radical was revealed unmistakably at the Lahore Congress. The moderates had no chance whatever and were quickly swept aside. The resolution boycotting the Round Table Conference, rejecting Dominion Status, declaring for complete independence, boycot-

ting the legislatures, and authorizing civil disobedience was carried almost unanimously, there being only a dozen or so votes in the negative. The section of the resolution which expressed appreciation of the Viceroy's efforts passed in the Subjects Committee with a majority of one lone vote, and in the Congress by a narrow margin. The section deploring the attempted assassination of the Viceroy also passed by a distressingly small margin, some seven hundred and ninety-six members voting against it.

Delegates who attempted to address the Congress in English were hooted down on a score of occasions, although no Indian language was understood by all those present. Only a courageous few succeeded in getting a hearing in English. The resolution favoring the repudiation of a portion of the national debt cannot be understood unless it is remembered that Great Britain saddled upon India much of the original cost of conquering the country and practically all the expenses from year to year of quartering British troops in India. Suppose that the thirteen colonies had been defeated in the Revolutionary War and had subsequently gained freedom, would they have shouldered the debts incurred by Great Britain in previously subjugating them? Whatever may be the justice of the case, it appears to me that the passage of this resolution by the Congress was unwise and inexpedient.

Speaker after speaker was guilty of disloyal or seditious utterance. Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams never desired freedom more passionately than do the Indian leaders nor used more vigorous language. "We have conspiracy cases," exclaimed President Jawaharlal Nehru, than whom no more honest or devoted patriot is to be found in any land, "going on in various parts of the country. They are ever with us. But the time has gone for secret conspiracy. We have now an open conspiracy to free this country from foreign rule." The boycott and mass civil disobedience are the methods by which the nationalists expect to obtain independence.

There is a strong tendency in European circles in India to scoff at the Indian National Congress and to regard its resolutions as mere words with no power behind them. That this body represents only a fraction of the whole country is obvious. Just a few of the sixty-nine million Moslems are represented in its councils. The sixty million untouchables are almost wholly inarticulate. The three million Sikhs are for the most part hostile. The National Liberal Federation embraces some of the ablest political leaders and is opposed to the demand for complete independence and separation. The nearly five million Christians, to the extent that they hold any political opinions whatever, are predominantly for Dominion Status, although there are notable exceptions within their ranks. The seventy-two million inhabitants of the Native States are ruled by their own Princes and are not directly involved in the present controversy. That is to say, groups comprising more than two-thirds of India's three hundred and nineteen millions are feebly represented in the Congress. Nevertheless, it is a fatal blunder to underestimate the significance of this movement for complete independence.

The strategy of non-violent non-cooperation is an exceedingly difficult one with which to cope. Lord Lloyd in a moment of frankness once admitted that it came "within an inch of succeeding" in 1921. "If they had taken the next step and refused to pay taxes," continues this former Governor of Bombay, "God knows where we should have been!" Thirty thousand patriots went to jail. The nationalists are in a much more desperate mood now than they were then. An English publicist in Calcutta expressed the opinion to me that if non-cooperation could be maintained on an extended scale for three months it would paralyze the Government.

The weapon of the industrial strike is also available. During the past few years large strikes have caused heavy loss to British investors as well as to Indian laborers. The condition of the urban workers in India is so wretched that serious unrest is chronic. They have little to lose by an uprising and always hope for some improvement by mass protest. The cry for independence is an appealing one to men of all races and the nationalist ranks in India will probably gain strength more rapidly than is generally expected.

Not least of all the factors is the magic spell over his people exercised by Mahatmaji. He told us that he thought that the response of the masses for the new call of non-cooperation would surpass that of 1920 and 1921. He has said to his intimate friends that he regards the coming crusade as the last and greatest fight of his career. He is prepared to put every ounce of his energy into it. Whether he can hold his followers to non-violence is problematical. The Communists as usual are fishing in troubled waters. About a hundred red flags of student sympathizers have been conspicuously waved at intervals in the sessions of the Congress. Open advocates of violence as they are, the Communists may deliberately incite the Government to repressive measures. If another General Dyer should again shoot down hundreds of unarmed Indians as was done at Amritsar in 1919, no one can predict what might happen. Moreover, the temper of the nationalists is certain to become more extreme the longer independence is delayed. In desperation, they may sweep Mahatmaji aside and resort to violence and terror.

Gandhi told us that his mind was "seeking a formula" which would enable him to continue non-violent non-cooperation even if certain unruly elements resorted to violence. He may find a justification on the ground that the abandonment of the non-violent campaign would merely increase the amount of violence. Even if he so desired, however, he would not be able to persuade his colleagues to abandon non-cooperation as he did in 1921. There will be no truce now until self-government has been achieved. Continued British rule will doubtless become increasingly difficult and diminishingly profitable. For these reasons it seems to me that British sovereignty in India is probably doomed.

Here the extreme action of the Lahore Congress seems to have shocked public opinion in England and America. It seems incomprehensible that with the Labor Government in office and a sympathetic Viceroy at Delhi the offer of a Round Table Conference should have been rejected. Why did they not wait and see what could have been achieved by discussion before resorting to non-cooperation? Numerous conversations have enabled me to understand some of the rea-

sons for this apparently precipitate and unwise action.

The simple truth is that Mahatma Gandhi and his colleagues believe that the Labor Government lacks both the will and the power to grant their minimum demands. They insisted upon an assurance that this degree of dominion autonomy enjoyed by Canada would be granted at the Round Table Conference. They recognized the wisdom and necessity of permitting England to continue certain controls for a limited period. They were willing to retain British troops and a British commander-in-chief for a number of years and to allow England to direct foreign affairs and relations with the Indian Princes. But—and here is the crux of the whole controversy—they insisted that all this should be done at the request of the free Dominion of India and should be terminated at its pleasure or by previous agreement.

If they could have achieved immediate and full autonomy inside the British Commonwealth they would have been satisfied. But they are wholly unwilling to accept the status of a minor in the family and wait many years for the bestowal of full rights and privileges. They dismiss as irrelevant the question as to whether or not India is fit for self-government. They say that freedom is an inalienable right of a people and that a foreign power has no authority to decide how much and at what time liberty shall be achieved by more than three hundred and nineteen million persons of another race on another continet. They are making the same claims that were advanced by the leaders of the thirteen American colonies and by many other predecessors in history. *And most Americans would do likewise if they faced a similar situation!*

When it became apparent, after the conversation of the Big Five with the Viceroy on December 23rd, that the British Government had an entirely different conception of Dominion Status and was thinking in terms of a gradual march to a distant goal, Mahatma Gandhi felt obliged to recommend the drastic program which was adopted by the Congress. It seemed to him a waste of time to attend a conference when it was known in advance that the minimum demands of the nationalists would be refused. Moreover, Gandhi expressed to us the opinion that the Labor Government did not have the power even if it had the will to grant full Dominion Status. Not only is it a minority administration, but within its own ranks are many vigorous opponents of autonomy for India. Many times Gandhi has said that liberty can never be gained as a free gift but must be claimed as an inherent right.

Then, too, Gandhi cannot afford to wait. He is past sixty years of age and in exceedingly frail health. If he is to make any further contribution to the cause of delivering India from alien rule, he must act quickly. There was the further factor that even if he had counselled moderation, the Congress would probably have rejected his advice and adopted independence and separation as its goal. At the Calcutta Congress his resolution favoring a year's delay was adopted by a narrow margin, and the nationalists have certainly become more impatient during the intervening twelve months.

All these were contributory factors but the primary reason for Gandhi's recommendation to the Congress was the bed-rock fact that he and many other nationalists have lost confidence in Great Britain and are determined to resist its domination to the utmost limit of their ability. They are resolved to run any risk rather than to submit longer to alien rule. They are not in a mood to count their blessings and to await with patience further gifts from a foreign government.

This is an appropriate hour for citizens of the United States to remind themselves of the temper displayed by their own Revolutionary Fathers and of the weapons these patriots felt justified in using. Pacifists who condemn the use of violence even in revolution and civil war can consistently criticize the present policy of the Indian nationalists on the ground that non-violence may soon be replaced by violence. But is it reasonable for others to do so? Mahatma Gandhi and his colleagues are able, in spite of the vast good that the British have accomplished in India, to present a far stronger indictment of British rule in India than George Washington and his associates framed against George the Third.

Lahore, India. KIRBY PAGE.

The Amazons, or the Petticoat Brigade

[Editor's Note: This is a song written for "co-eds" in the schools and colleges of this country which provide military training for their students. We publish it in UNITY as a beautiful illustration of what military education is doing to our boys and girls.]

I've traded my horse and sold my cow;
I'm through with a farmer's life, and now!
For I'm going to be a soldier now
With women in the Army.

Chorus
Oh, it's fun to be a soldier, boys,
And with the women stand
In uniform at drill, boys,
And hold each other's hand.

I've placed my books on the dusty shelf;
I'll study no more to "improve myself"—
For I've no desire for fame or pelf,
With women in the Army.

I've discounted goods and closed my store,
And a "For Sale" sign is on the door—
For I'll not need to work any more
With women in the Army.

The fire has gone out in the boiler room,
And business is under the seal of doom—
For there isn't a girl to tend a loom
With women in the Army.

The banker weeps o'er his pile of gold,
And factories crumple 'neath moss and mold—
For there's nothing more to be bought and sold
With women in the Army.

The grass is growing all over the street,
And aged men are all you'll meet—
For the young men are gone with flying feet
With women in the Army.

A soldier's hardships now will cease;
The colonel has promised complete release,
And each shall have at least one a piece—
But what'll it do to the Army!

Mars Triumphant

(Embracing the sad story of the annihilation of the city of New York)

"Abandon hope, all ye who enter here."

The nation was in mourning and in the pangs of manifest apprehension. What a dreadful experience, what horrible hours!

No one desired it, yet it happened and came about as an inevitable Nemesis with no safe margin for escape.

Weren't the great powers of the world prepared for it? For what were all their great burdens of taxation and military preparation if not for exactly such an occasion, feared by all yet accepted as the only free course to be madly engaged in? Indeed, strange, very strange, the phenomenon, seeing the great nations issuing their great declarations of good will and peace while their respective departments of war were feverishly and even enthusiastically getting ready for an exhibition of the most dreaded carnival of organized murder and destruction. Obsolete weapons are bravely scrapped off; while submarines, air-bombers and chemical preparations soar to the gravest heights.

Ungrounded and illy inflated fears and jealousies, an innocent incident and sad accident, a hasty exchange of illy-worded notes, and the crash came—relations broken up, hostilities begun and war finally declared to the tune of aroused masses, whose light and reasoning sank into an abyss of darkness in proportion as their passions and mob-fever rose.

Only seven days from that fatal hour that saw the commencement of the dreaded struggle, and what a trail of horrors, what cruelties, what sacrifices in wealth and lives! But none could foresee that such a horrible spectacle was possible as unveiled before the nation on the early morning of the eighth day of the conflict. The star of the nation, the greatest city of the American Empire, was no more, literally not in existence: huge piles in the midst of shattered and blackened frames pointing to the place of the city's residential and business palaces, with its millions of inhabitants literally wiped out of existence, their dead and hardened bodies crowding the ruins, wherever ill fate had overtaken them. Not a single breathing life escaped, nor could it from the all-penetrating gases that saturated the city on that awful night.

At first the news of an actual enemy invasion and the destruction of the city of New York, with an incredible total loss of life, left the people aghast; but as the trying hours of the morning moved on and brought authenticity to the news and rumors, a heart-rending cry of grief, bitterness and ferocious revenge reverberated throughout the land, culminating in the universal demand upon the military authorities to explain. Weren't the people told that we were well prepared and ready for any military emergency that might arise? Weren't the taxpayers' millions of dollars spent annually for preparedness that would make just such a terrible calamity impossible? Wasn't our impregnable fleet of battleships, submarines, navy dirigibles and airplanes strung along the coast line together with our mighty coast defense guards to face and repulse the invader? All these and similar questions were heard wherever the angered and unquestionably frightened citizens gathered, in public and in private, and to these the authorities felt helpless to reply.

Of course the General Staff knew full well the answer. But how dare they to reveal it to the public? Could they come out in the open with the startling yet true statement of admission that there is one phase in modern warfare against which they can never fully guard and thus must fall prey to sooner or later? No amount of preparedness can break up the heavy fog and treacherous clouds above our heads, and no armor is yet perfected to shield us from the skies. The nations of the world, the masses that bear the taxes and lay down their lives, were made to feel that more battleships, more submarines, more airplanes and more powerful coast guard implements could insure peace and safety; and for that reason the wealth of nations was poured out lavishly in the annual budgets for military defense. But the first week of the opening of hostilities struck like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky the confiding citizens, and left all in the agonies of maddening anticipations. If the city of New York with its wealth and life could be laid so waste overnight in the face of all military perparedness, what can prevent its fate to its sister cities of lesser fame?

As soon as the sad news of the great disaster spread, the General Staff met in special session. The official data on the unheard of brutality made the case clear—that is, clear and concrete to the trained minds of the military experts who *themselves were just waiting for the opportunity to accomplish a similar atrocity upon the enemy,* who just managed to be ahead of the game. The military chiefs knew that modern wars could not be fought any more to submission, but that an enemy could be starved and frightened into submission by some inhuman maneuvers of terror, such as the economic blockade or the complete annihilation of a city with its inhabitants—the aged, sick, mothers and infants not excluded.

The scheme was simple and easy of execution. The enemy knew too well that New York had an excellent coast defense line, surrounded by an excellent fleet on water, under sea and in the air; and knowing how dangerous and impregnable this force was, he chose to ignore it altogether and direct a deadly blow with a minimum of risk and maximum of desired results.

On that dreadful night, under cover of a heavy fog, hundreds of miles from the coast and in the open sea, it was an easy matter for the enemy submarines to discharge into the clouds a small but powerful fleet of painted air monsters, whose newly perfected, specially constructed noiseless motors made their approach absolutely unannounced and unseen. The air monsters were in the hands of expert pilots who knew their tasks as well as the geography of their field of action. Passing above the clouds the unsuspecting fleet below, they executed a well-planned maneuver, forming a strategic formation and thus taking up above the

sphere of the entire area of the city below. Upon a given signal, a deluge of specially constructed bombs, for destruction and asphyxiation, began to rain upon the doomed city, and was not stopped till everything lay waste and lifeless. The monsters departed unseen, as they appeared, leaving behind an indescribable scene of destruction and agonies. Eulogy, fame and decoration awaited the young daring patriots who so valiantly executed the ordered tasks of their country.

The General Staff knew all this well. But how could they tell the aroused nation that modern warfare makes out of military preparedness a farce and the wealth expended a waste and that there can be no absolute safety from its lash? Where are the brave men to admit their own defeat or uselessness?

All weapons of future warfare are centered in the clouds and behind the laboratory walls; and against the invisible monsters of the sky and the all penetrating deadly fumes of chemical warfare there can be no safeguards but PREVENTION: *a policy of fair dealing and justice which make fears and wars unnecessary, unthinkable, inexcusably criminal. The twentieth century teaches that military preparedness does not, will not and cannot make our cities safe. Who will dare to tell this to the nation in mourning and in the pangs of manifest apprehension?*

DAVID JOBMAN.

The Study Table

A Practitioner of the Humanities

Of the making of books, says the author of the Fourth Gospel, there is no end. And of the flood of autobiographies there seems to be an endless stream. What justification is there for a man to write an *apologia pro vita sua?* Cardinal Newman seemed to produce his under the stimulus of Kingsley's lack of sympathy. At all events he did what to this reviewer seems his finest work under the sting of the lash of a typically British fire-eater. In this fall's list of books there comes to our consideration the *apologia* of a man who writes with something of the touch of Newman, and who is certainly well within the Newman tradition.

It was not uncommon, in medieval times, for men to combine within themselves the offices of physician and priest. Pope John XXI was such. So was Linacre, the friend of Erasmus and Canon of St. Paul's. So were many of the Protestant clergy in the days when the American colonies were too poor to support both parson and doctor. And so is John Rathbone Oliver. As a matter of fact, he combines in himself four offices: he is a medical officer of the Baltimore criminal courts; he is a consulting psychiatrist; he is a university teacher; and he is a clergyman in the Episcopal church. "Foursquare"* is Dr. Oliver's attempt to set forth how happily this combination works.

The book naturally divides itself into four parts, each dealing with one of the four-fold aspects of Dr. Oliver's work. From other sources, one gathers that Dr. Oliver is as greatly responsible as anyone for the introduction of medical and psychiatric work into the criminal courts of Baltimore. It began in a tiny room in the courthouse which nobody seemed to want; and, for a long time, it was conducted by Oliver on the very generous salary of a court attendant. This work is now one of the conspicuously successful examples of medical social service in the United States. But of that one hears very little in the book—the man needs a good press agent. He talks of mental testing and the mental aspects of crime, of insanity in relation to crime, of criminals he has known, of alcohol and drugs; and of each of these he speaks with authority.

It is certainly hard to begin life anew at forty; and yet this is what Oliver has done as regards his work as a psychiatrist. He had entered the medical profession fairly late in life, and his work in the criminal courts led him to want to extend himself into the psychiatric field. So he set up an office with a capital consisting chiefly of faith and friends. He succeeded. If suffering engenders an ability to enter into the lives of a psychiatrist's patients, it probably also has a corresponding danger to the doctor of too great subjectivism. How Oliver strikes a balance between "hard-boiled" objectivism and too great a sympathetic response is well worth considering.

Certainly for most human beings, the work of a court medico-legal officer and the private practice of psychiatry should be enough. Not so is it with our author. He must enroll himself as a candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Johns Hopkins. Imagine a man well into middle life settling down to study Greek at odd times! So Dr. Oliver goes on, assuming job after job. From student he blossoms into Warden of a university residence hall, and from student of the history of medicine he graduates into the professorship thereof at the University of Maryland.

The last part of the book Oliver calls The Altar. It is the all too brief record of his spiritual pilgrimage. There is written, for him who runs to read, the story of a man's quest for peace. The descendant of Boston Brahmins, the great-grandson of Robert Gould Shaw, becomes an High Church Anglican parson. Somehow Anglo-Catholicism failed completely to hold him, and he casts himself into the outer darkness. For a while he delighted in the world and all that therein is. Never in the world could he find peace. So he turned, as thousands of young men have turned before him, and thousands probably will continue to turn, to Rome. In Rome itself he found friendship and encouragement. Never for a moment, even when he wanted it least, did John Oliver lose sight of his priesthood. A reviewer wrote as a title for a review of his "Victim and Victor," "Once a priest, always a priest." Always was Dr. Oliver a priest. So, when he found himself unable to exercise his priesthood in the Anglican Church, it was to Rome he looked for the opportunity once more to assume his office. Somehow—providentially it seems to Dr. Oliver—there always descended a *deus ex machina* to prevent his ordination in the Roman Catholic Church. After several discouragements of this sort, Oliver turned from theology to the study of medicine at the University of Innsbruck in Austria. Apparently he put aside all thought of his ministry until he returned to America, and in Balti-

*"Foursquare," the Story of a Fourfold Life. By John Rathbone Oliver. New York, The Macmillan Co. 1929. pp. 305.

more he met an old friend of his divinity school days. Oliver seems to have drifted into an Episcopal Church in Baltimore, and there he underwent an experience which the writers on the psychology of religion would describe as mystical. At all events, he had come back into the Anglican Church, and immediately he set about to work for his restoration to the ministry. With time that came. Oliver had found rest and peace at the last.

Three texts does Oliver place at the head of "Foursquare": one from the Apocalypse, one from Erasmus, and one from Shelley. One he might have added, and that from the "Confessions" of St. Augustine: "O God thou has made me for thyself, and my soul is restless until it find rest in thee."

Is a final word of appraisement necessary? The book holds the reader's interest. It is vivid; it is understanding; it gives the point of view of one who has won wisdom through suffering and labor. It gives one great answer to the question that men sometimes ask who are troubled about their souls: what shall I do to be saved? And Oliver gives the answer, out of his experience, again in the words of Augustine —*laborare est orare;* which was once translated liberally: the truest prayer is work. There is more than a touch of Newman in the book; not so much in what it says or in what it leaves unsaid—the touch is one of feeling. Perhaps it is best summed up in a phrase by John Haynes Holmes in a private letter to this reviewer—it is a noble autobiography by a noble man. The way of spiritual life which Oliver has made his own is not one easily to be commended to most of those who read UNITY; but if Oliver has made the beauty of that life more vivid to those who read "Foursquare," then he has done much. One thing is certain: the book is a genuine contribution to the literature of religious experience. And for some of us it goes a great deal further than that.

ALFRED ARTYN GROSS.

Correspondence

India's Wrongs

Editor of UNITY:

January 26th was celebrated as "Independence Day" throughout India. Why has the wish for self government grown so strong? These are some of the reasons:

When India came under British control—first that of the East India Company and later that of the crown—it was one of the richest countries in the world. It is now one of the poorest. All the old writers and travelers testify to its wealth and the prosperity of its people. Now the vast majority of the inhabitants are miserably, unspeakably poor.

India, when it came under British rule, was a great weaving nation. It made all the cloth for its own use, and exported large quantities of muslins, silks, shawls, brocades, etc., that were famous the world over for their beauty. These were not made in the cities alone. In millions of cottages throughout India, the cultivators of the soil wove during the months when the climate made field work impossible; and the combination of agriculture and weaving enabled them to live in comfort.

Vast masses of gold and jewels were taken out of the country bodily, under the East India Company, during the wars that finally subjugated India, and during the so-called Indian Mutiny, which was a desperate attempt of the oppressed to regain their freedom. The money with which the cotton mills of Lancashire were started was part of the loot of India. But the machine-made textiles of England could not compare in fineness and beauty with the textiles of India; so the British government put a prohibitory import duty on Indian textiles, and barred them out of Britain altogether. If India had been free, she would have met this by putting a prohibitory import duty upon foreign textiles, and would thus have saved her home market. Instead, great quantities of cheap British textiles were dumped upon India, with no import duty or only a nominal one, and the Indian weavers were ruined. Professor Horace H. Wilson, the historian, says: "The Foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms. . . . It is a melancholy instance of the wrong done to India."

Long after, when even the knowledge how to make the old, beautiful fabrics had been lost, a number of textile mills were started in India. Then the British government of India actually imposed an excise duty upon every yard of cloth made in India, to hamper it in competing with British-made goods.

When it came under British rule, India was full of manufactures. It has been the systematic endeavor of the British to substitute the use of British manufactures for those of India. Millions of artisans were ruined in consequence. The ideal of the British was to make of India a source for the supply of cheap raw materials for the manufacturers of Britain, and a market for the manufactured goods. Almost the whole population were thus thrown back on agriculture. Eight-tenths of them are now said to be engaged in it, as their sole resource.

When India came under British rule, it was the greatest ship-building country in the world, and had an immense commerce. The British wanted British ships to have a monopoly of carrying all India's exports and imports. Partly by legislation, and partly by other methods of coercion, India's great shipping industry was destroyed.

When India came under British rule, education was widely diffused. Sir Thomas Munro testified at an official hearing, in 1813, that there were "schools in every village for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic." The East India Company drew its "scribes and accountants" from the villages.

The Indian village was a unit in itself. In the course of India's long history, the people had worked out a form of local self-government which suited them, and under which they throve. Every village in Aryan India was a little community, owning the communal lands around it. The schoolmaster was always one of the village functionaries. Dynasties rose and fell, and waves of invasion swept over the land, leaving the village community practically unchanged. It was reserved for the British to destroy its immemorial form of organization. This was not done in malice. But the British were fundamentalists, and did not approve of communal lands. The British government now claims to own all the land in India, and rents it out. Every cultivator is now a tenant farmer. No provision was made for the schoolmaster: the villagers could not afford to pay him, now that they no longer owned their lands; and the blight of ignorance settled down upon India. After two centuries of British rule, it is said that about 90 per cent of the people are illiterate; and this illiteracy, which is largely the result of a British blunder, is now used as an argument for the continuance of British rule!

Before India came under British control, the land-tax to the state was a certain share of the produce. If in any year the harvest was poor, the tax for that year was lightened automatically. The British decreed that the rent must be paid in cash, and estimated it on the basis of an average harvest. J. Ramsay MacDonald says in his book, "The Government of India," Chapter 11:

"It (the land revenue) has been raised too often oppressively. . . . The habit of the government has been to exact from the cultivator the uttermost farthing, over and above a standard of life which has been much too low."

There is only too much testimony how low it is. Sir William Hunter, for many years Director General of Indian Statistics, says that 40,000,000 of the people seldom or never get enough to eat.

Before India came under British rule, there were only about two famines in a century, and those were local. In

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

AN APPEAL TO OUR FELLOW-CITIZENS

To an American public concerned for peace and convinced that true and enduring peace can only rest upon international goodwill and progressive removal of deep-seated grievances in the minds of all peoples, present events in India have, we are convinced, a profound significance which we have not fully appreciated.

It is a new thing in history when a people 330 million strong strive for internal unity and freedom from the yoke of foreign rule by non-violent methods under the leadership of a saint. It is an encouraging thing that at this juncture the Indian Nationalist Movement deals not with a British Tory government but with a Labor government which has given proof of the sincerity of its desire for peace and its opposition to imperialism. Has it ever happened before that a national independence day has been observed with such deep emotion as in India, yet without violence? Or that an eager leader of a great movement of national revolt like Jawaharlal Nehru should inaugurate the movement by again pledging himself and his country to non-violent methods? Still more recently Gandhi has declared that he will urge the end of such measures of civil disobedience as have been begun if the Viceroy will give effect to a list of social and economic reforms—among them the abolition of the iniquitous salt tax and the reduction of salaries in the most expensive civil service in the poorest country of the world.

Surely here is a situation which with all its practical and psychological difficulties still admits of peaceful solution. Britain indeed stands not to lose prestige and trade by granting self-rule but rather to gain by the sense of gratitude and friendship her act will kindle. Let public opinion everywhere affirm this truth and lend its weight to a settlement of great issues by mutual agreement and the world will have a new precedent and new encouragement in its life bringing quest for peace and goodwill.

But let this moment pass, let violence break out, let Britain answer force by force and passions will be unloosed the end of which no man can see. Not one but a chain of wars may conceivably follow upon violent revolt and violent repression, involving not two but many nations and making mockery of all our efforts after peace. Even the attempt to further peace by reduction of naval armament will look to millions of the world's peoples less like an approach to international co-operation than an agreement among the strong to preserve their power.

It is no adequate answer to point to the obstacles in India to the establishment of a successful national government. They will not be overcome by foreign rule resting on bayonets. India has presented her case to the world against foreign government based solely on conquest, a government alien to her spirit and her desires, which despite the individual probity of its officials has exploited the Indian people. Were the case for independence less strong it would still be true that no believer in democracy, no opponent of imperialism, no advocate of a fellowship of free peoples can accept the right of any British government to put down by force of arms the revolt of India's millions. That way lies the negation of the hopes of all Socialist internationalists, all believers in the practicability of peace, all lovers of the brotherhood of nations.

Rarely have peoples stood at the cross-roads with fairer opportunity to decide their direction. The old way of violent revolt or violent repression leads to war, to the perpetuation of hate and the encouragement of despair. Gandhi and the Indians who stand with him offer the world a new revolution not only in the end sought but in the method which in the long run affects the worth of any end. We Americans are without direct power or direct responsibility in the matter. But in our little world we cannot look unmoved upon this crisis. We have not only a right but a duty to put the imponderable power of public opinion behind an urgent plea to the Indian people to persist in the non-violent paths in which they have chosen to lead mankind and to the British Government to justify our confidence in its zeal and capacity as the pioneer of peace by agreement and goodwill.

Signed by: John Dewey, Professor,

---

the first quarter of the 19th Century, there were five famines, with an estimated loss of 1,000,000 lives; in the second quarter, two famines, with a loss of 400,000 lives; in the third quarter, six famines, with a record of 5,000,000 deaths; and in the fourth quarter, eighteen famines, with an estimated mortality of from 15,000,000 to 26,000,000. During all these famines there was food enough in India to feed everybody, but the people were too poor to buy it.

Dr. J. T. Sunderland says: "As a matter of fact, virtual famines are really perpetual in India. Even when the rains are plentiful and the crops good, there is always starvation on a wide scale somewhere." And the people are so weakened by chronic hunger that in epidemics they die like flies.

There is a constant drain of money from India to England. The government of India is the most expensive in the world. Its alien rulers give themselves high salaries and large pensions, and keep for themselves practically all the well-paid posts. The people of India are taxed more than twice as heavily as those of England and more than three times as heavily as those of Scotland, although they are very much poorer. They have to pay all the costs of the army kept in India to hold them in subjection. In addition, the Indian troops have been forced to take part in a long series of wars, waged generally not for the benefit of India but purely for the aggrandizement of the British Empire. There were 33 such wars, large and small, in the 41 years from 1859 to 1900, some of them wars in distant countries like China and Egypt; and India has been saddled with a large share of their cost—more than $450,000,000 being paid out for this during the last century alone. After the World War India's alien rulers voted that she should make a "voluntary gift" of $500,000,000 to Great Britain towards the expenses of the war; but there was nothing voluntary about it.

Under the old emperors, all the taxes paid in India were spent in India, and came back to the people. Now a large part of the revenue goes abroad and never returns. India has famines because agriculture is overtaxed, manufactures crippled, and nearly half the yearly revenue sent abroad.

The British judges in India usually render impartial justice between European and European, or between Indian and Indian; but in any case between a European and an Indian, it is almost impossible for the Indian to get justice.

Despotic government is demoralizing both the rulers and the ruled. Most of the British in India—not all—treat the people with arrogance, and make them feel their contempt at every turn.

Long subjection to foreign rule always has a degrading effect. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Liberal Premier of Great Britain, wrote: "Good government is no substitute for self-government. The atmosphere of subjection is poisonous, killing all that is virile and worthy. . . . I must remind my countrymen that Britons have stooped to Prussian and Russian methods in the government of India." Gandhi, Ramsay MacDonald and many others have noted the bad effects upon character.

British rule has brought some important benefits to India, but it has brought greater evils: physical starvation, mental illiteracy, and spiritual deterioration. The British are the best administrators of colonies and dependencies in the world; but even they cannot make a bad system work well.

At the time of the World War, the people of India were promised—or thought they were promised—that if they would stand by the Allies, they should be granted dominion status. Instead, they were given a deceptive arrangement called "dyarchy," which really left the despotic power of their British rulers untouched.

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." It is a huge injustice that 320,000,000 people—almost one-sixth of the inhabitants of the globe—should be ruled against their will, not for their own good, but for the good of a comparatively small number of foreigners. Every American should wish well to India in her struggle for independence.

Dorchester, Mass. ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Columbia University, New York; Oswald Garrison Villard, Editor, "The Nation," New York; Norman Thomas, Socialist Candidate for President of the U. S. A.; Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Pastor, Community Church, N. Y. C.; Dr. J. T. Sunderland, author of "India in Bondage"; Robert Morss Lovett, Professor, University of Chicago, Chicago; William Floyd, Editor, "The Arbitrator," New York; Roger Baldwin, Director, American Civil Liberties Union; Devere Allen, Editor, "The World Tomorrow," New York; Dr Charles Fleischer, former editor, "The N. Y. American"; B. W. Huebsch, The Viking Press, New York; Louise Adams Floyd, Ex-President, The Civic Club, New York.

The India Independence League of America, No. 15 Park Row, New York City, is the first American organization which stands wholly for the promotion of the cause of Indian Independence by Peaceful Means. Sympathizers with its object are invited to send in their membership applications and inquiries direct to: T. H. K. Rezmie, Founder-Director of The India Independence League.

A JEW'S CREED

1. "I believe in one God, the universal father of all mankind. All mankind are therefore members of the one great family in which we are all brothers.

2. "God is the embodiment of our noblest aspirations and our ideals of justice, love, mercy and truth. He reveals Himself to man and in man, through these verities.

3. "Man is made in the image of God; that is, he has the potentialities of divinity, of justice, love, mercy and truth within him. In so far as he develops these potentialities and does just, loving, merciful and equitable deeds, he is Holy and God-like. When he does acts that are anti-social conflicting and contrary to such qualities of God, he is sinful.

4. "Man should act righteously not because of fear of punishment, nor pomise of reward either here or hereafter, but in order that he be more in attune with god. Live righteously in order to be righteous. No other reward is necessary.

5. "Prayer and worship is the projection by man, of his ideals, hopes and aspirations. It is valuable for it aids man to constantly reach higher in his eternal quest for the good life.

6. "All literature that tends to lift man to more lofty realms of living is sacred. The Bible is sacred in so far as it fulfills this prerequisite. Sacredness does not depend on the authorship, time, language nor place of writing, but on the messages contained.

7. "Science and religion can not conflict because the purpose of science is to describe and discover the facts of life and the world, while the function of religion is to evaluate man's surroundings and to guide him onward and upward toward a better life for mankind.

8. No one religion has a monopoly of the truths. Every religion that makes man conscious of his relation to the entire human family and urges him to strive for its welfare, is fulfilling a true and useful function.

9. "Any group or organization that narrows man's mind and heart, and causes him to do unsocial acts, is irreligious and unholy, even though it calls itself a religious institution.

10. "Every group and every individual should regard himself and itself as chosen to spread the precept and example, the message of righteousness and unselfish living upon the earth."

(Rabbi) Myron W. Jacobs.
Troy, N. Y.

FEBRUARY

Attentions to your wardrobe and home should include the cleansing and sanitation of garments and furnishings now showing the effects of Winter's soot and grime. Only by our new continuous flow process are the finest results obtained.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs,
Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK ON INDIA

Strongly endorsed by Tagore, Gandhi, Lajpat Rai, Mrs. Besant, Presidents of the Indian National Congress, Indian Leaders of All Parties, practically the Whole Periodical Press of India.

INDIA IN BONDAGE

Her Right to Freedom and a Place
Among the Great Nations
By JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, M. A., D. D.

Pp. 556. 12 Illustrations. Price at Booksellers $4.00, by mail $4.10.
Lewis Copeland Co., Inc.
Publishers, 119 West 57th St.
New York, N. Y.

This book, just from the press in New York, was published a few months ago in India. The British Government, alarmed at its quick and great sale, suppressed it, and arrested its publishers. Practically all India answered by indignant protests. Mahatma Gandhi published an article in the book's defense, four columns in length.

No other word in our generation has been so universally acclaimed by the highest Indian authorities, as a true and just portrayal of India's civilization, life, and political conditions.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE the poet writes: "If Americans would know the true India, they cannot have a better guide than Dr. Sunderland. I regard his book as the best informed, most just and trustworthy that has come from any pen. A part of its high value is as an unanswerable reply to the misrepresentations in Miss Mayo's **Mother India.**"

MRS. ANNA BESANT writes: "Dr. Sunderland's powerful chapters should be read by everybody who would understand India."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES says: "No other American is so widely known or so loved in India, as Dr. Sunderland, and this book gives eloquent testimony as to the reasons why."

THE PATRIKA, Calcutta's leading daily declares: "**India in Bondage** easily takes the first place among all the books on India in recent years."